

REMARKS

The office action of March 18, 2003, has been carefully considered.

It is noted that the specification is objected to for containing various spelling/typographical errors.

The drawings are objected to for not having textual labels. The drawings are further objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) for failing to show various of the claimed features.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over the patent to Sandifer et al.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandifer et al. in view of the patent to Aslin et al.

In connection with the Examiner's objection to the

specification, applicant has amended the specification to correct the errors points out by the Examiner.

Turning now to the drawings, applicant has amended the figure to provide textual labels for the numbered elements. Concerning illustration of the claimed elements, applicant respectfully submits that all of the claimed features are illustrated in the drawing. The implements 11, identification characteristic 15, central data bank 13 and remote access 14 are all shown in the drawing. Applicant wishes to point out that the claimed invention is a method and as such is not easily subject to illustration. The place of stay, present location, certification status, age and future checking dates recited in claim 8 are not structural features that can be illustrated. They are merely types of data that cannot be illustrated. Similar arguments hold for the other features of original claims 3-5 mentioned by the Examiner. What the Examiner is requesting is an illustration of method steps. Applicant is not aware of any regulation that requires illustration of a method step. Applicant respectfully submits that those skilled in the art would readily understand how to carry out the claimed steps without the need for additional drawings not already in the application. Since no structure is being claimed it is respectfully

submitted that the drawing in the application is more than sufficient to facilitate a thorough understanding of the claimed invention.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the objections to the drawings are overcome and should be withdrawn.

In view of the Examiner's rejections of the claims, applicant has canceled claims 1-6 and added new claims 7-10.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims now on file particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. In drafting the new claims applicant has corrected the problems pointed out by the Examiner as being in original claim 1. In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The claims presently on file recite a method for management of aeronautical industry implements which have to be sent to special workshops for checking, maintenance, calibration, certification and

repair. The inventive method carries this out by providing the implements with an individual, machine readable identification characteristic, storing the implement status data and the identification characteristic in a central data bank, and permitting a remote access to the data bank while excluding paper or electronic accompanying documents containing information concerning the implements by sending of the implements. The individual identification characteristic is made available by a radio frequency transponder and the identification characteristic of an implement serves as proof of authorization for permitting the access to data stored in the data bank.

Thus, the present invention provides documentation, which in the prior art had to accompany the implement in paper form, remotely from the implement via a data bank. Authorization to access the data bank is permitted by providing the identification characteristic for the implement in question. The remotely accessible data bank makes it easy to obtain updated information concerning the implement without the need for documents to accompany the implement.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims now on file

differ essentially and in an unobvious manner from the methods disclosed in the reference.

Turning now to the references, and particularly to the patent to Sandifer, it can be seen that this patent discloses a computer aided maintenance and repair information system for equipment subject to regulatory compliance. In this system information is stored so that it can easily be retrieved by service and repair technicians to help them service and repair equipment. Sandifer does not store or provide information that is specific to an individual implement or piece of equipment. For example, in the Sandifer system, if 10 identical pieces of equipment were present the Sandifer database would provide the same prestored service and repair instruction data for all 10 pieces of equipment. In the presently claimed invention on the other hand, each of the 10 pieces of equipment would have its own individual store of data in the database and this data would not show previously stored service and repair instructions, but instead would provide status data which indicates the actual status of the specific piece of equipment as it is being, for example, serviced or repaired. Sandifer does not disclose such a method in which the documentation indicating the status of the implement or piece of equipment does

not need to accompany the implement in order for an authorized person to determine the status.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over the above-discussed reference is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The patent to Aslin has also been considered. The Examiner combined this reference with Sandifer in determining that claims 5 and 6 would be unpatentable over such a combination. Applicant respectfully submits that Aslin adds nothing to the teachings of Sandifer concerning a method as discussed above in connection with independent claim 7. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of these references does not teach the invention recited in the claims presently on file.


In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are

respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or charges required at this time in connection with this application may be charged to Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 11-1835.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Klaus P. Stoffel  
Reg. No. 31,668

For: Friedrich Kueffner  
Reg. No. 29,482  
317 Madison Avenue, Suite 910  
New York, New York 10017  
(212) 986-3114

Dated: September 18, 2003

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Arlington, VA 22313-1450, on September 18, 2003.

By:   
Klaus P. Stoffel

Date: September 18, 2003